

United States Patent and Trademark Office

| | DSIATES DEFARTMENT OF COMMERC |
|----------|------------------------------------|
| | States Patent and Trademark Office |
| Address: | COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS |
| | P.O. Box 1450 |
| | Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 |
| | warm neuto dov |

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/707,641 | 12/29/2003 | Richard M. Fitzpatrick | GDRMF01Q | 1640 |
| 33076 . 75 | 590 08/30/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| | E. DOBBIN, PATENT A | JOHNSON, STEPHEN | | |
| 4278 SOUTH 6220 WEST WEST VALLEY CITY, UT 84128-6501 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 3641 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004 | 4 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/707,641 | FITZPATRICK, RICHARD M. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | (| | | | |
| | Stephen M. Johnson | 3641 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | Idress | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing carned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | iy. ommunication. | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 D | ecember 2003. | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward | nce except for formal matters, pro | osecution as to the | e merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 53 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposi tion of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | wn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8 and 10</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>5,7 and 9</u> is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Applica tion Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2003 is/a | 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 December 2003</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | , | = | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | kaminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form P | ГО-152. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a |)-(d) or (f). | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | , , , , | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | s have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | s have been received in Applicati | ion No | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio | rity documents have been receive | ed in this National | Stage | | | | |
| application from the International Burea | * ** | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not receive | ed. | | | | | |
| .• | | | | | | | |
| Attachm ent(s) | | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | | |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F | | O-152) | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/2003. | 6) Other: | • • • | - | | | | |

1. Applicant's election without traverse of species B (fig. 7) in the reply filed on 8/9/2004 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-10 read on the elected species and an action on these claims follows.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the flat polygonal tab; ellipsoidal tab; wedge; shape having any combination of rounded and straight edges; and a rectangular solid (see claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3641

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 claim "a shape having any combination of rounded and straight edges". However, neither the written description or the drawings give a description of what these combinations of shapes look like or consist of.

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 claim "a shape having any combination of rounded and straight edges". However, neither the written description or the drawings give a description of what these combinations of shapes look like or consist of. Further, applicant claims any combination of rounded and straight edges when the disclosure could at best only describe only a limited number of rounded and straight edge combinations.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

b) a removable floor plate;

c) a feed end;

see fig. 1

adjacent B

Art Unit: 3641

| | (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. | | | |
|-------|---|----------------------|--|--|
| 7. | Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Douglas (665). | | | |
| | Douglas (665) discloses an ammunition magazine comprising: | | | |
| | a) a magazine body with sidewalls; | В | | |
| | b) a removable floor plate; | ď, | | |
| | c) a feed end; | see fig. 2 | | |
| | d) a tab handle that is a wedge or combination of straight and | Н, К | | |
| | rounded edges; and | | | |
| | e) a plurality of hollows in handle tab. | K | | |
| 8. | Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaidos. | | | |
| | Gaidos discloses an ammunition magazine comprising: | | | |
| | a) a magazine body with sidewalls; | С | | |
| | b) a removable floor plate; | see fig. 4 | | |
| | c) a feed end; and | 3 | | |
| | d) a tab handle that is a wedge or combination of straight and | 14, 26 | | |
| | rounded edges. | | | |
| 9. | Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate | ed by Milovanovitch- | | |
| Koka. | | | | |
| | Milovanovitch-Koka discloses an ammunition magazine comprising: | | | |
| | a) a magazine body with sidewalls; | С | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/707,641 Page 5

Art Unit: 3641

d) a tab handle that is a wedge or combination of straight and c₁₄, c₁₅ rounded edges; and

e) a plurality of hollows in handle tab.

C₁₅

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 11. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,689 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a handle being a protruding tab is commonly known in the magazine art as demonstrated by either Wise (element #15) or Linke (elements #19 and #22).
- 12. Claims 5, 7, and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Brown, Musgrave, and Haeghen disclose other state of the art magazines.
- 14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Johnson whose telephone number is 703-306-4158.

Art Unit: 3641

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4177.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9326. The fax phone number for after final communications is (703) 872-9327.

Thyle h has

STEPHEN M. JOHNSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Stephen M. Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3641

SMJ